

REMARKS

The final Office Action dated February 21, 2007, has been reviewed carefully and it is believed that the application has been amended to place it in condition for allowance.

Priority

5 Applicant acknowledges that matter first presented in a continuation-in- part application is given the priority of the filing date of the continuation-in-part application and as to matter set forth in the original application, this matter is entitled to the benefit of filing date of the original, parent application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

10 Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Published Patent Application No. 2003/0082427 (“Prasad”).

Applicant’s invention as set forth in representative independent claim 1, as amended, comprises in part:

A liquid feed fuel cell system comprising:

15 (A) a direct oxidation fuel cell including a membrane electrode assembly;

 (B) a source of liquid fuel; and

 (C) a fuel container coupled with said fuel cell, including:

20 (i) a first inner bladder being substantially fully expanded upon being filled with liquid fuel, and having a fuel outlet conduit to supply liquid fuel to said direct oxidation fuel cell; and

 (ii) *a second inner bladder for receiving effluent from said fuel cell through an effluent inlet leading from said*

25 *fuel cell into said fuel container, said second inner bladder being disposed directly contacting said first inner bladder such that as effluent is received from the fuel cell, the second inner bladder expands and contacts said first inner bladder displacing fuel from said first inner bladder to deliver fuel to said fuel cell, and wherein said second inner bladder is not under application of force.*

30

In contrast, Prasad teaches the use of a movable barrier 40 configured to move as fuel is removed from fuel solution outlet 28 simultaneously reducing the volume of fuel storage area 24 and increasing the volume of waste storage area 26. (Paragraph 26) Because Prasad requires this movable barrier, the design also requires pressurizer 80 (Fig. 2) disposed within the waste storage area 26 to urge against the movable barrier 40.

Applicant's invention does not require these additional components, which is an important distinction in devices having space, weight and cost constraints. The Specification describes this distinction by teaching that "the effluent bladder 1305b is not under the application of force because the effluent is desirably entering into the bladder, rather than being expressed from it." (Specification page 15, line 31 through Page 16, line 1).

In order to enhance the claims and to better claim the invention and to clarify these distinctions, claim 1 has been amended to recite that *said second inner bladder being disposed directly contacting said first inner bladder such that as effluent is received from the fuel cell, the second inner bladder expands and contacts said first in-*

*ner bladder displacing fuel from said first inner bladder to deliver fuel to said fuel cell,
and wherein said second inner bladder is not under application of force.*

Absent these features of Applicant's claimed invention, Prasad cannot have anticipated the invention as claimed in the amended independent claim and the claims dependent therefrom. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned in order to further the prosecution of this application in any respect.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rita M. Rooney/
Rita M. Rooney
Reg. No. 30,585
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500